

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

William Alexander,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 14-12249

Gerald Rosen, *et al.*,

Honorable Sean F. Cox

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Acting *pro se*, William Alexander ("Plaintiff") filed this action against multiple Defendants. In an order issued on June 19, 2014 (Docket Entry No. 4) this Court: 1) declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims; 2) granted Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action.

In addition, this Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause, in writing, why his claims against Judge Gerald Rosen and Judge Cheryl Matthews should not be dismissed based upon absolute judicial immunity, stating:

Upon initial review of Plaintiff's Complaint, it appears that Plaintiff's claims against Judge Gerald Rosen and Judge Cheryl Matthews should be dismissed because those Defendants are entitled to absolute judicial immunity. The Court hereby **ORDERS PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing, no later than June 30, 2014**, why his claims against Judge Rosen and Judge Matthews should not be dismissed based upon judicial immunity.

(*Id.* at 3).

After Plaintiff failed to respond to that Show Cause Order, on July 28, 2014, this Court issued an order dismissing Plaintiff's claims against Judge Rosen and Judge Matthews based on

judicial immunity. (Docket Entry No. 5). Plaintiff's pending motion acknowledges that Plaintiff received this order on July 29, 2014. (Docket Entry No. 26 at 2).

On December 16, 2014 – more than four full months after this Court's July 28, 2014 Order was issued – Plaintiff filed a "Motion Objecting To This Court's Order Applying Judicial Immunity To Judge Gerald Rosen And Cheryl Matthews" (Docket Entry No. 26). The Court construes this motion as a motion seeking reconsideration of this Court's July 28, 2014 Order.

Motions for reconsideration in civil cases are governed by Local Rule 7.1 of the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan. Local Rule 7.1 provides that a motion for reconsideration must be filed within 14 days after entry of the judgment or order at issue. *See* Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h)(1).

Because Plaintiff "is proceeding *pro se*, his pleadings are liberally construed and are held to less stringent standards than those prepared by attorneys. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972); *Williams v. Browman*, 981 F.2d 901, 903 (6th Cir.1992). Nevertheless, those who proceed without counsel must still comply with the procedural rules that govern civil cases." *Whitson v. Union Boiler Co.*, 47 F. App'x. 757, 759 (6th Cir. 2002).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Docket Entry No.26) IS DENIED AS UNTIMELY.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 18, 2014

S/ Sean F. Cox
Sean F. Cox
U. S. District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

William Alexander,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 14-12249

Gerald Rosen, *et al.*,

Honorable Sean F. Cox

Defendants.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 18, 2014, the foregoing document was served on counsel of record via electronic means and upon William Alexander via First Class mail at the address below:

William Alexander
17515 W. 9 Mile Road, Suite 980
Southfield, MI 48075

S/ J. McCoy
Case Manager